

REMARKS:

Reexamination and further consideration of the subject application, in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By the foregoing amendments, Claim 1 has been rewritten to define each of the plurality of openings that make up the multi-port connector of the invention as being bounded by a top wall, a bottom wall and two side walls and that each of the plurality of openings is capable of receiving at least two jack connectors therein concurrently. Support for this amendment to Claim 1 is found in the figures of drawing and related disclosure.

In the outstanding Official Action all Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasterchick, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,244,420) in view of Sarkissian (U.S. Patent No. 5,415,570). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Pasterchick, Jr. et al., the primary reference, discloses a connector socket which is capable of receiving either a plain old telephone service (POTS) connector plug or an integrated services digital network (ISND) basic rate connector plug. The socket contains a single opening which is sized to receive either one of these two connector plugs but not both at the same time. Accordingly, Pasterchick, Jr. et al. does not disclose a multi-port connector comprising a plurality of openings with each opening being capable of receiving at least two jack connectors therein concurrently as recited in amended Claim 1. The Pasterchick, Jr. et al. socket connector does not have a plurality of openings but only one opening and this opening is not capable of receiving two jack connectors therein at the same time. Thus, the Pasterchick, Jr. et al. patent does not disclose or suggest Applicant's multi-port connector and, in fact, leads away from this connector design by teaching a socket connector having a single opening which can receive either of two different style connector plugs but not both concurrently.

The Sarkissian patent, likewise, discloses a connector in which each opening of the connector is capable of receiving a single plug connector. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Sarkissian of a multi-port connector comprising a plurality of openings with each opening being capable of receiving at least two jack connectors at the same time.

For these reasons it is apparent that neither Pasterchick, Jr. et al. or Sarkissian alone or in combination disclose a multi-port connector having the features recited in Applicant's

Serial Number: 10/615,037
Group Art Unit: 2839
Atty. Ref. No. 111420-00213

claims as presently amended and those references cannot obvious Applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.